

REMARKS

Claims 1-50 were presented for examination, are pending and are rejected. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24-30, 32-37, 39 and 41 are rejected as being anticipated by Cespedes et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In each independent claim (1, 16, 22, 30 and 45), the applicant's processing step includes the application of a wave-based algorithm that can map an angular location. The examiner points to paragraphs [0164]-[0189] from the reference as disclosing the applicant's processing step; however, paragraphs [0164]-[0189] only discuss variations in the calculation of VP_{ave} which is defined in paragraph [0160] as vessel parameter. Paragraph [0160] states:

In accordance with yet another aspect of the present invention, measurements of vessel parameter VP (e.g., temperature, strain, pressure and pH) may be provided as an average summation value along a cross-section or side-section of vessel V.

The Examiner's argument that paragraphs [0164]-[0189] disclose the processing step would only be valid if the term VP_{ave} includes angular location. However, the reference clearly distinguishes VP_{ave} from angular position. See paragraph [0049] which states:

In accordance with another aspect of the present invention, data for a vessel parameter may be displayed on an interactive 3-dimensional graph in which the data may be provided as a function of axial and angular position within the vessel. Selection of a particular value of one of the variables (*e.g., vessel parameter data, axial position or angular position*) may prompt display of a 2-dimensional graph in which the coordinate axes comprise the remaining two variables, or display of an image of the associated cross-section or side-section having the vessel parameter data overlaid thereon." Emphasis added.

Thus, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, paragraphs [0164]-[0189] of the reference do not teach calculation of angular position. Therefore the rejection of claims 1, 16, 22 and 30 should be withdrawn. The rejection of claims 3-9, 11, 12 and 14 should be withdrawn because they depend from claim 1. The rejection of claims 17, 19 and 20, should be withdrawn because they depend from claim 16. The rejection of claims 24-29 should be withdrawn because they depend from claim 22. The rejection of claims 32-37, 39 and 41 should be withdrawn because they depend from claim 30.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 2, 18, 23, 31, 45-47, 49 and 50 are rejected as being unpatentable over Cespedes et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection of claim 2 should be withdrawn because it depends from claim 1, which should be allowable as discussed above. The rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn because it depends from claim 16, which should be allowable as discussed

above. The rejection of claim 23 should be withdrawn because it depends from claim 22, which should be allowable as discussed above. The rejection of claim 31 should be withdrawn because it depends from claim 30, which should be allowable as discussed above.

The rejection of claim 45 should be withdrawn because, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, paragraphs [0164]-[0189] of the reference do not teach calculation of angular position. The rejection of claims 46, 47, 49 and 50 should be withdrawn because they depends from claim 45.

Claims 10, 21, 38 and 48 are rejected as being unpatentable over Cespedes et al. in view of Sieben et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection of claims 10, 21, 38 and 48 should be withdrawn because they depend from claims 1, 16, 30 and 45 respectively, which should be allowable as discussed above.

Claims 13, 15, 40 and 42-44 are rejected as being unpatentable over Cespedes et al. in view of Zhdanov et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection of claims 13 and 15 should be withdrawn because they depend from claim 1, which should be allowable as discussed above. The rejection of claims 40 and 42-44 should be withdrawn because they depend from claim 30, which should be allowable as discussed above.

Conclusions

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance based on claims 1-50 in view of the foregoing comments.

If any impediments remain to prompt allowance of the case, please contact the undersigned at 808-875-0012.

Respectfully submitted,

/John P. Wooldridge #38,725/
John P. Wooldridge
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,725

Dated: February 8, 2008